299.934
THE
111

ULT LIBRARY
BANGALORE.
Accn. No 111

LIBRARY COPY

THEOSOPHY

A MAGAZINE DEVOTED TO

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, AND THE BROTHERHOOD OF HUMANITY

THE STUDY OF OCCULT SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY, AND ARYAN LITERATURE

Vol. XLVII—No. 1 **November, 1958**

THE Esoteric doctrine of the East having furnished and struck the keynote—which is as scientific as it is philosophical and poetical, as may be seen, under its allegorical garb—every nation has followed its lead. It is from the exoteric religions that we have to dig out the root-idea before we turn to esoteric truths, lest the latter should be rejected. Furthermore, every symbol —in every *national religion—may be read esoterically, and the proof furnished for its being correctly read.*

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

ULT LIBRARY
BANGALORE.
Accn. No 111

CONTENTS

CONVICTION AND DOCTRINE 1
NATURAL AND SUPERNATURAL 4
THE DUAL ASPECT OF WISDOM 9
MASTERS, ADEPTS, TEACHERS, AND DISCIPLES 19
YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK—AND ANSWER 22
SOME THOUGHTS ON UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD 25
OUR DIVINE PROGENITORS 28
THEOSOPHICAL PSYCHOLOGY 34
THE MANY-FACED HERO 37
ON THE LOOKOUT 39

$3.50 per Annum *35 Cents per Copy*

Edited and Published by

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY

245 West 33rd Street, Los Angeles 7, California, U. S. A.

111
299.934
THE

Publisher's Announcements

THEOSOPHY: Established November, 1912, by Robert Crosbie. Published monthly by The Theosophy Company, at Los Angeles, California, U. S. A. This Magazine is edited independently of any theosophical society or other organization. The Publishers assume full responsibility for all unsigned articles herein.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: No subscriptions are accepted for less than one year of 12 numbers, but subscriptions may begin with any desired number. All subscriptions, orders for single back numbers, and back volumes, bound or unbound, should be accompanied by the necessary remittance. Price $3.50 per annum; single numbers of the current volume, 35 cents each; back numbers, 50 cents each; back volumes, unbound, $5.00 each; for library style binding, prices on request. *Volumes I and XII are out of print.*

COMMUNICATIONS: Contributions submitted for publication should be typewritten double-spaced on one side of the paper only, with wide margins, and copies should be in all cases retained by the writers, as no manuscripts are returned.

CORRESPONDENCE: Letters from subscribers and readers are welcomed, with criticisms, comments or questions on any subject treated in the magazine. Questions on Theosophical Philosophy and History will be replied to direct, or, if of sufficient general interest, in the pages of the Magazine.

BEQUESTS AND DONATIONS: Gifts and legacies will be gladly received from those in sympathy with the objects of this Magazine when such benefactions are unencumbered and unrestricted. Donors should make their gifts to

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY, of Los Angeles, California, U. S. A., which is an incorporated association, legally empowered to receive such donations and bequests in furtherance of its objects. These objects are:

(*a*) To form the nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste, or color;

(*b*) The study of ancient and modern religions, philosophies and sciences, and the demonstration of the importance of such study; and

(*c*) The investigation of the unexplained laws of Nature and the psychical powers latent in man.

Books for Christmas Gifts

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, 1875-1950

This volume presents the history of the Theosophical Movement against the background of modern culture. It describes the work and public careers of the founders of the Movement and deals with issues of controversy among theosophists. It is thoroughly documented with references to the Theosophical literature and other sources.

351+xiii pages; cloth $5.00

THE BOOK OF IMAGES, by Dhan Gargya

A volume of tales and dialogues cast in the timeless setting of primitive village life. Attractively printed and unusually bound in a manner suggestive of the craftsmanship and ways of those who figure in its scenes. These stories first appeared in THEOSOPHY many years ago.

200 pages; four plates; cloth ..... Special, $1.00

SELECTIONS FROM THE UPANISHADS, AND THE TAO TE KING

Charles Johnston's translation of selected Upanishads, together with the Tao Te King of Lionel Giles, in one volume.

142 pages; cloth $2.00

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY

245 West 33rd Street

Los Angeles 7, California, U. S. A.

UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS.
"Maitri-Bhavan"
15, Sir Krishna Rao Road,
BANGALORE-4, South India.

LIBRARY COPY

A U M

In his life-form the individual is necessarily only a fraction and distortion of the total image of man. —JOSEPH CAMPBELL

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XLVII **November, 1958** **No. 1**

CONVICTION AND DOCTRINE

THE essential conviction of the Theosophist is that man—any man—is capable of seeing beyond himself and therefore capable of reaching beyond himself. This is another way of affirming that the egocentric predicament is never absolute but only relative, that something of a higher vision is always possible. A definition is thus provided, in functional terms, of a difference usually expressed in metaphysical terminology—the distinction between Spirit and Matter. For while it is the nature of matter to solidify, fix, or limit, it is the nature of that which men call spirit to invest the fixed motions of matter with new meanings. And this, also, is "the pith or marrow" of occultism. As Madame Blavatsky puts it in *Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge*:

> Apparently, the whole basis of occultism lies in this, that there is latent within every man a power which can give him true knowledge, a power of perception of truth, which enables him to deal first hand with universals if he will be strictly logical and face the facts. Thus we can proceed from universals to particulars by this innate spiritual force which is in every man.

Every doctrine is possessed of many-layered meanings and is, in a sense, therefore "secret." The title of Madame Blavatsky's major work may itself be read and understood in different ways, something which she endeavored to make clear in conversation with those who constituted her closest "natural pupils" during the last years of her life. Mr. Robert Bowen was one of these, then a Commander in the Royal Navy, and in some notes taken by him of informal discussion with H.P.B. concerning *The Secret Doctrine,* we encounter this interesting paragraph:

> *The Secret Doctrine* contains, she says, just as much as can be received by the world during this coming century. "The World" (she explained) means Man living in the Personal Nature. This "world" will find in the two volumes of the S.D. all its utmost comprehension can grasp, but no more. But this is not to say that the Disciple who is not living in "the world" cannot find any more in the book than the "world" finds. Every form, no matter how crude, contains the image of its "creator" concealed within it. So likewise does an author's work, no matter how obscure, contain the concealed image of the author's knowledge. . . . From this saying, I take it that the S.D. must contain all that H.P.B. knows herself, and a great deal more than that, seeing that much of it comes from men whose knowledge is immensely wider than hers. Furthermore, she implies unmistakably that another may well find knowledge in it which she does not possess herself. It is a stimulating thought to consider that it is possible that I myself may find in H.P.B.'s words knowledge of which she herself is unconscious. She dwelt on this idea a good deal. X said afterwards: "H.P.B. must be losing her grip," meaning, I suppose, confidence in her own knowledge. But . . . and . . . and myself, also, see her meaning better, I think. She is telling us without a doubt not to anchor ourselves to her as the final authority, nor to anyone else, but to depend altogether upon our widening perceptions.
>
> (Later note on above: I was right. I put it to her direct and she nodded and smiled. It was worth something to get her approving smile!)

To place faith in spiritual intuition means to sense that there is that in each man which may at any time, reach beyond the fixities of habitual opinion. And here we arrive at a simple explanation of the "attitude of Theosophy," which finds expression whenever soul-search takes place from a non-sectarian, non-partisan basis. As Madame Blavatsky indicated in her *Key to Theosophy,* the Theosophical disciples of Ammonius in ancient Alexandria respected *all* religions and *all* doctrines, in the sense that they respected the capacity of the individual to discover truths within those doctrines. The purpose of doctrine, Theosophically considered, is to arouse spiritual intuition, by preparing a channel. Further preparation, of course, comes through use of disciplined reason.

When a Theosophical student, in any age, pursues such a work, he moves inevorably towards conviction of the existence of a *gnosis,* or "secret doctrine." We may say "inexorably" because when one places one's faith in the reality of spiritual intuition, he must also believe that profound *truths* are being discovered and rediscovered daily. Further,

that all men who have lived since the beginning of time have contributed to a storehouse of wisdom, and that by discovering fraternal association in the aura of that wisdom, one deepens his understanding of the meaning of universal brotherhood. His feeling of brotherhood with all men and all thought flows from his conviction of the reality of spiritual intuition, and he comes to realize that great and uplifting doctrines are the reflection, at the verbal or symbolic level, of self-discoveries.

Every uplifting doctrine is a blending of the gnosis with some particular stage of man's capacity to perceive it, and while, for this very reason, each specific doctrine must ultimately be transcended by understanding, a doctrine also contains psychological truths in symbolic guise. It is in this context that the Doctrines of Theosophy, as presently delineated, may be considered by an inquirer. But there are intermediary steps which may be taken between "study of doctrine" and the inspiration provided by one's own intuition. And these intermediary steps must take the form of such philosophical propositions as are provided at the outset of Madame Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine.*

Teachings and Capacities

The effort, both in study and promulgation, should be an attempt to rise to the higher level of thought of the Teachings, rather than concretizing them by so-called simplification. On the basis of reincarnation, it can be readily seen that there is within us a latent capacity for understanding deep spiritual truths, and this can only be developed by the constant raising of the thought above the level of the personal to the plane of the impersonal and universal. Only study of metaphysical ideas and universal concepts can purify the lower mind and the lower personal life. Let us beware of "simplified" Theosophy, as this leads to diluted and perverted Theosophy.

—William Q. Judge

NATURAL AND SUPERNATURAL

WHAT seems entirely natural to one human being—wholly "according to law"—may to another appear to be gross supernaturalism, no more than what men call superstition. The natural and the supernatural are a pair of opposites, like good and evil, pleasure and pain, truth and error, and subject to the same relativities. The psychological universe, which is the real universe of human beings, is made up of the pairs of opposites, and all men, whatever their degree or level of development, conduct themselves out of regard for these polarities of value. That they may have radically differing views concerning the pairs of opposites in no way alters the fact that the human continuum of experience is bounded by them, or the further fact that human evolution consists in learning to place the opposites in right relation to the hidden reality which transcends them both.

How do men determine the value of the opposites—how, that is, do they decide what is evil and what good? How do they distinguish between truth and error? Why should the "naturalism" of one man become "supernaturalism" to another?

In any system, the determination of position and the evaluation of scale depend upon where a man is in the system. In a psychological system, which is the nature of the system of human experience, the determination of position arises from the idea of the self. Judgment of relationships must grow out of the conception of what is related and how the relationship affects the ends of the being or thing which is related. Hence the importance of the idea of the self and the God-idea, in all phases of human life.

This question is involved in further subtleties. An ultimate pair of opposites springs from the apparent polarity of the self and the world. But there is a sense in which the self *is* the world. A man who thinks about himself and the world in this sense dissolves the psychological reality of this pair of opposites. When "the universe grows I," there is no more any good and evil, no more any light and darkness, or any division of any sort.

There is also a sense in which the self is anything a man thinks it to be. In *The Secret Doctrine,* this capacity of self-identification is called *Ahankara.* It is an aspect of the function of *Manas* and anon saves and

anon damns us. It saves by being the source of all knowledge, since there is no knowledge except that which is obtained by being or becoming what is wished to be known. It damns by reason of its susceptibility to the influence of matter, which has an innate tendency to run to form. When an expression of self-consciousness becomes the captive of a material form, delusions are produced. The worst and typical delusion of which human beings are capable is the delusion that they are less than the universal self. When consciousness finds expression through a form, there is the natural tendency, produced by the qualities of matter, for the intelligence to identify itself with that particular form. Thus men think of themselves as being their bodies, or their desires, or whatever in their lives is uppermost as a principle of action.

It follows that, in any period of history, the prevailing ideas about the pairs of opposites result from the dominant idea of the self in that period. Conventionally, both science and religion embody fixed ideas on the subject of the self, and also of the world. This is the critical content of science and religion. The rest becomes chiefly verbiage and rationalization.

The traditional religion of the Western world obtains its idea of the self from the notion of creation as found in Christian teaching. While there is no rigor in Christian thought as regards the idea of the self, the relationships of the individual soul to the Creator have plain implications of the finiteness of the self. Further, there is the proneness of the soul to "sin" and its dependence upon God or the Son of God for the attainment of a desirable relationship with its environment.

Accordingly, these rules of "progress" as found in Christian teaching produce a fairly precise conception of the self according to Christianity. The self is in radical separation from primary reality, or God. It is finally dependent upon God for what good it may achieve. What it has of its own nature is simple weakness. What it has of good it gets from God, and the means of getting it is worship and obedience to God's will.

These, then, are the raw materials from which are constructed the scales which run between the extremes of all the psychological pairs of opposites. From these assumptions are deduced what is evil and what is good. "Natural" and "supernatural," of course, have a very different meaning in the Christian system, being synonymous with "profane" and "divine," but those meanings are inevitably determined by the Christian account of man, God, and the world.

The scientific point of view also presents a conception of the human self as finite and subject to the play of external forces. But where in religion the external forces are those of an anthropomorphic God, in science they are the blind forces of nature. These outside forces of science, while blind, are orderly, and capable of study and definition. The forces represented by God, on the other hand, while supposed to be the result of divine intelligence, are filled with mystery and are said to be incomprehensible. From a human point of view, therefore, they are disorderly and cannot be placed upon a basis of law. Thus the scientific outlook produces for the words "natural" and "supernatural" meanings which articulate these assumptions about the nature of things. The "natural" is always what results from the play of blind forces. The "supernatural" has no place in nature, but represents only human delusions about intelligent forces behind the veil of nature—forces which do not in fact exist.

Actually, the word "natural" has no legitimate place in the Christian vocabulary. Traditionally, "natural" has application to everything that is not a work of God, but since nothing happens except at the instance of God's will, there is nothing unnatural. There is a contradiction, or difficulty, here, in Christian teaching, since the power of Evil, springing from the Devil, is said to come from action in alienation from God's will. Often, the "natural" has been identified with the Devil, by Christians who have tried to compose a consistent body of thought about the world, but since demonology and the entire category of problems represented by evil have been reduced to a vague abstraction in modern Christian (save for Catholic) thought, the "natural" has become rather a neutral phase of reality than something evil or alienated from God.

The word "supernatural" presents similar problems for modern, civilized man. With the decline of aggressive materialism, there has been a tendency, even among scientists, to allow a qualified reality to phenomena of a sort which used to be automatically condemned as "supernatural" and therefore nonexistent. For science, at least, a little of the content of the supernatural is creeping back to respectability in the form of vague abstractions such as "intuition" and a "spiritual element." But these conceptions are without much rational foundation from a strictly scientific point of view, having, for the scientist, about the same validity as the "natural" has for the Christian thinker; the use of these terms, in both cases, represents a concession to what seem facts

of experience rather than the result of disciplined and consistent thinking.

We come, now, to an attempt to resolve these difficulties philosophically. The beginning must be made with a true idea of the self as the clarifying agent. Theosophically, the self and the ultimate ground of reality are *one*. And since all that occurs, takes place under law, the "supernatural" has no more place in the Theosophical scheme of things than it has in the scientific view. There is, however, in Theosophy, a level of transcendental reality which corresponds to the order of experience which the religionists term "supernatural," the important difference being that the Theosophic idea of transcendental reality is of a reality which is as much under the rule of law as the order of physical reality.

In Theosophy, there is nothing but the self and its embodiments. The embodiments of the self produce the various levels of consciousness, the sole attribute of the self being the principle of consciousness.

What value, then, have the terms "natural" and "supernatural," in Theosophic thought? They are useless in metaphysics, although they have a role in connection with the analysis of psychological relationships. In the passage from a false idea of the self to a true conception, it is inevitable that human beings should experience difficulty in overcoming delusions which grew out of the limited conceptions of the self inherited from the past. That is, the effort to think at a transcendental level is bound to suffer in some measure from the old supernaturalist ideas of religion.

Take for example the idea of perfected beings. This is the philosophical conception which replaces one aspect of the God-idea. It is necessary, in reflecting on this idea, to retain the feeling of radical unity while contemplating the godlike qualities and powers with which a perfect being is endowed. This puts a great strain upon a mind heavily laden with Christian conceptions. There is the tendency to make the perfected being into a replica of the personal God and to transfer the emotionalism of religion to the idea of the guru-chela relationship. The early days of the Theosophical Movement afforded many illustrations of this importation of the psychology of supernaturalism into Theosophy. It is relatively easy for the student with a religious background to cherish the secret longing to be "helped" by the generosity of a "great being." When this happens, the philosophic polarity of the Self and

the World is substantially replaced by the theological polarity of the sinner and God, although the vocabulary remains an imitation of the philosophic vocabulary. All sorts of justifications of this substitution are made, as devices of the personality. There is much talk of "devotion" and the "heart doctrine," both of which are of immeasurable importance in the disciple life. It is only when they are made to serve as substitutes for the self-reliant activity of *Manas* that they become evidence of a regressive religiosity, born of a subtle intrusion of the Personal-God idea.

Emancipation from the cloying confinements of the Personal-God idea can come only from a true idea of the self and from the true "naturalism" of motives which spring spontaneously from the aspiring ego-soul. There is a *natural* attraction of the soul to knowledge, since it is the nature of the *Manas* to know. When human action is in response to this dynamism of the soul, the psychological delusion in the opposition of natural and supernatural dies away; true impersonality results, and a sense of strength, competence, and potentiality grows from within. With these attitudes and feelings primary in the psychological life of the individual, a philosophic conception of perfected beings begins to pervade the student. They are no longer the means to his personal salvation, but beings who are doing with great skill the work that he longs to perform himself. He comes to them—or thinks of himself as coming to them—not as a suppliant in quest of release from pain, but as a worker who wants to learn more about his work. This is a spiritual attitude toward perfected beings, because it is an impersonal attitude. It arises from a philosophic conception of the self.

WHERE WE STILL BELONG

I'd like to get away from earth awhile
And then come back to it and begin over.
May no fate wilfully misunderstand me
And half grant what I wish and snatch me away
Not to return. Earth's the right place for love:
I don't know where it's likely to go better.

—ROBERT FROST

THE DUAL ASPECT OF WISDOM

> No doubt but ye are the people and wisdom shall die with you.
>
> JOB xii. 2.
>
> But wisdom is justified of her children.
>
> MATTHEW xi. 19.

IT is the privilege—as also occasionally the curse—of editors to receive numerous letters of advice, and the conductors of *Lucifer* have not escaped the common lot. Reared in the aphorisms of the ages they are aware that "he who can take advice is superior to him who gives it," and are therefore ready to accept with gratitude any sound and practical suggestions offered by friends; but the last letter received does not fulfil the condition. It is not even his own wisdom, but that of the age we live in, which is asserted by our adviser, who thus seriously risks his reputation for keen observation by such acts of devotion on the altar of modern pretensions. It is in defence of the "wisdom" of our century that we are taken to task, and charged with "preferring barbarous antiquity to our modern civilization and its inestimable boons," with forgetting that "our own-day wisdom compared with the awakening instincts of the Past is in no way inferior in *philosophic wisdom* even to the age of Plato." We are lastly told that we, Theosophists, are "too fond of the dim yesterday, and as unjust to our glorious (?) present-day, the bright noon-hour of the highest civilization and culture"! !

Well, all this is a question of taste. Our correspondent is welcome to his own views, but so are we to ours. Let him imagine that the Eiffel Tower dwarfs the Pyramid of Ghizeh into a mole-hill, and the Crystal Palace grounds transform the hanging gardens of Semiramis into a kitchen-garden—if he likes. But if we are seriously "challenged" by him to show "in what respect our age of hourly progress and gigantic thought"—a progress a trifle marred, however, by our Huxleys being denounced by our Spurgeons, and the University ladies, senior classics and wranglers, by the "hallelujah lasses"—is inferior to the ages of, say, a hen-pecked "Socrates and a cross-legged Buddha," then we will answer him, giving him, of course, our own personal opinion.

Our age, we say, is inferior in Wisdom to any other, because it pro-

---

NOTE.—This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for September, 1890, and was last reprinted in THEOSOPHY for February, 1940.

fesses, more visibly every day, *contempt for truth and justice, without which there can be no Wisdom.* Because our civilization, built up of shams and appearances, is at best like a beautiful green morass, a bog, spread over a deadly quagmire. Because this century of culture and worship of matter, while offering prizes and premiums for every "*best* thing" under the Sun, from the biggest baby and the largest orchid down to the strongest pugilist and the fattest pig, has no encouragement to offer to morality; no prize to give for any moral virtue. Because it has Societies for the prevention of physical cruelty to animals, and none with the object of preventing the moral cruelty practised on human beings. Because it encourages, legally and tacitly, vice under every form, from the sale of whiskey down to forced prostitution and theft brought on by starvation wages, Shylock-like exactions, rents and other comforts of our cultured period. Because, finally, this is the age which, although proclaimed as one of physical and moral freedom, is in truth the age of the most ferocious moral and mental slavery, the like of which was never known before. Slavery to State and *men* has disappeared only to make room for slavery to *things* and *Self,* to one's own vices and idiotic social customs and ways. Rapid civilization, adapted to the needs of the higher and middle classes, has doomed by contrast to only greater wretchedness the starving masses. Having levelled the two former it has made them the more to disregard the substance in favor of form and appearance, thus forcing modern man into duress vile, a slavish dependence on things inanimate, to use and to serve which is the first bounden duty of every *cultured* man.

Where then is the Wisdom of our modern age?

In truth, it requires but a very few lines to show why we bow before ancient Wisdom, while refusing absolutely to see any in our modern civilization. But to begin with, what does our critic mean by the word "wisdom"? Though we have never too unreasonably admired Lactantius, yet we must recognize that even that innocent Church Father, with all his cutting insults anent the heliocentric system, defined the term very correctly when saying that "the first point of Wisdom is to discern that which is false, and the second, to know that which is true." And if so, what chance is there for our century of falsification, from the revised Bible texts down to natural butter, to put forth a claim to "Wisdom"? But before we cross lances on this subject we may do well, perchance, to define the term ourselves.

Let us premise by saying that Wisdom is, at best, an elastic word—at any rate as used in European tongues. That it yields no clear idea of its meaning, unless preceded or followed by some qualifying adjective. In the Bible, indeed, the Hebrew equivalent *Chokmah* (in Greek, *Sophia*) is applied to the most dissimilar things—abstract and concrete. Thus we find "Wisdom" as the characteristic both of divine inspiration and also of terrestrial cunning and craft; as meaning the Secret Knowledge of the Esoteric Sciences, and also blind faith; the "fear of the Lord," and Pharaoh's magicians. The noun is indifferently applied to Christ and to sorcery, for the witch Sedecla is also referred to as the "*wise woman* of En-Dor." From the earliest Christian antiquity, beginning with St. James (iii, 13-17), down to the last Calvinist preacher, who sees in hell and eternal damnation a proof of "the Almighty's *wisdom,*" the term has been used with the most varied meanings. But St. James teaches two kinds of wisdom; a teaching with which we fully concur. He draws a strong line of separation between the divine or *noëtic* "Sophia"—the Wisdom from above—and the terrestrial, psychic, and devilish wisdom (iii, 15). For the true Theosophist there is no wisdom save the former. Would that such an one could declare with Paul, that he speaks that wisdom exclusively only among them "that are perfect," *i.e.,* those initiated into its mysteries, or familiar, at least, with the A B C of the sacred sciences. But, however great was his mistake, however premature his attempt to sow the seeds of *the true and eternal gnosis* on unprepared soil, his motives were yet good and his intention unselfish, and *therefore* has he been stoned. For had he only attempted to preach some particular fiction of his own, or done it for gain, who would have ever singled him out or tried to crush him, amid the hundreds of other false sects, daily "collections" and crazy "societies"? But his case was different. However cautiously, still he spoke "not the wisdom of this world" but *truth* or the "hidden wisdom . . . which none of the Princes of this World know" (I Corinth, ii.) least of all the *archons* of our modern science. With regard to "psychic" wisdom, however, which James defines as terrestrial and devilish, it has existed in all ages, from the days of Pythagoras and Plato, when for one *philosophus* there were nine *sophistae,* down to our modern era. To such wisdom our century is welcome, and indeed fully entitled, to lay a claim. Moreover, it is an attire easy to put on; there never was a period when crows refused to array themselves in peacock's feathers, if the opportunity was offered.

But now as then, we have a right to analyze the terms used and enquire in the words of the book of Job, that suggestive allegory of Karmic purification and initiatory rites: "Where shall (true) wisdom be found? Where is the place of understanding?" and to answer again in his words: "With the ancient *is* wisdom and in the length of days understanding" (Job xxviii, 12 and xii, 12).

Here we have to qualify once more a dubious term, viz: the word "ancient," and to explain it. As interpreted by the orthodox churches, it has in the mouth of Job one meaning; but with the Kabalist, quite another; while in the Gnosis of the Occultist and Theosophist it has distinctly a third signification, the same which it had in the original *Book of Job,* a pre-Mosaic work and a recognized treatise on Initiation. Thus, the Kabalist applies the adjective "ancient" to the Manifested WORD or LOGOS (*Dabar*) of the for ever concealed and uncognizable deity. Daniel, in one of his visions, also uses it when speaking of Jahve—the androgynous Adam Kadmon. The Churchman connects it with his anthropomorphic Jehovah, the "Lord God" of the *translated* Bible. But the Eastern Occultist employs the mystic term only when referring to the re-incarnating higher Ego. For, divine Wisdom being diffused throughout the infinite Universe, and our impersonal HIGHER SELF being an integral part of it, the *atmic* light of the latter can be centered only in that which though eternal is still individualized—*i.e.,* the noëtic Principle, the manifested God within each rational being, or our Higher *Manas* at one with *Buddhi.* It is this collective light which is the "Wisdom that is from above," and which whenever it descends on the personal Ego, is found "pure, peaceable, gentle." Hence, Job's assertion that "Wisdom is with the Ancient," or *Buddhi-Manas.* For the Divine Spiritual "I," is alone eternal, and the same throughout all births; whereas the "personalities" it informs in succession are evanescent, changing like the shadows of a kaleidoscopic series of forms in a magic lantern. It is the "Ancient," because, whether it be called Sophia, Krishna, Buddhi-Manas or Christos, it is ever the "first-born" of *Alaya-Mahat,* the Universal Soul and the Intelligence of the Universe. Esoterically then, Job's statement must read: "With the Ancient (man's Higher Ego) *is* Wisdom, and in the length of days (or the number of its re-incarnations) is understanding." No man can learn true and final Wisdom in one birth; and every new rebirth, whether we be reincarnated for weal or for woe, is one more lesson we receive at the hands of the

stern yet ever just schoolmaster—KARMIC LIFE.

But the world—the Western world, at any rate—knows nothing of this, and refuses to learn anything. For it, any notion of the Divine Ego or the plurality of its births is "heathen foolishness." The Western world rejects these truths, and will recognize no *wise* men except those of its own making, created in its own image, born within its own Christian era and teachings. The only "wisdom" it understands and practises is the psychic, the "terrestrial and devilish" wisdom spoken of by James, thus making of the *real* Wisdom a misnomer and a degradation. Yet, without considering her multiplied varieties, there are two kinds of even "terrestrial" wisdom on our globe of mud—the real and the apparent. Between the two, there is even for the superficial observer of this busy wicked world, a wide chasm, and yet how very few people will consent to see it! The reason for this is quite natural. So strong is human selfishness, that wherever there is the smallest personal interest at stake, there men become deaf and blind to the truth, as often consciously as not. Nor are many people capable of recognizing as speedily as is advisable the difference between men who are wise and those who only *seem* wise, the latter being chiefly regarded as such because they are very clever at blowing their own trumpet. So much for "wisdom" in the profane world.

As to the world of the students in mystic lore, it is almost worse. Things have strangely altered since the days of antiquity, when the truly wise made it their first duty to conceal their knowledge, deeming it too sacred to even mention before the *hoi polloi.* While the mediæval *Rosecroix,* the true philosopher, keeping old Socrates in mind, repeated daily that all he knew was that he knew nothing, his modern self-styled successor announces in our day, through press and public that those mysteries in Nature and her Occult laws of which he knows nothing, have never existed at all. There was a time when the acquirement of Divine Wisdom (*Sapientia*) required the sacrifice and devotion of a man's whole life. It depended on such things as the purity of the candidate's motives, on his fearlessness and independence of spirit; but now, to receive a patent for wisdom and adeptship requires only unblushing impudence. A certificate of divine wisdom is now decreed, and delivered to a self-styled "*Adeptus*" by a regular majority of votes of profane and easily-caught gulls, while a host of magpies driven away from the roof of the Temple of Science will herald it to the world in every market-

place and fair. Tell the public that now, even as of old, the genuine and sincere observer of life and its underlying phenomena, the intelligent co-worker with nature, may, by becoming an expert in her mysteries thereby become a "wise" man, in the terrestrial sense of the word, but that never will a *materialist* wrench from nature any secret on a higher plane—and you will be laughed to scorn. Add, that no "wisdom from above" descends on any one save on the *sine quâ non* condition of leaving at the threshold of the Occult every atom of selfishness, or desire for personal ends and benefit—and you will be speedily declared by your audience a candidate for the lunatic asylum. Nevertheless, this is an old, very old truism. Nature gives up her innermost secrets and imparts *true wisdom* only to him, who seeks truth for its own sake, and who craves for knowledge in order to confer benefits on others, not on his own unimportant personality. And, as it is precisely to this *personal benefit* that nearly every candidate for adeptship and magic looks, and that few are they, who consent to learn at such a heavy price and so small a benefit for themselves in prospect—the really wise Occultists become with every century fewer and rarer. How many are there, indeed, who would not prefer the will-o'-the-wisp of even passing fame to the steady and ever-growing light of eternal, *divine* knowledge, if the latter has to remain, for all but oneself—a light under the bushel?

The same is the case in the world of materialistic science, where we see a great paucity of really learned men and a host of skin-deep scientists, who yet demand each and all to be regarded as Archimedes and Newtons. As above so below. Scholars who pursue knowledge for the sake of truth and fact, and give these out, however unpalatable, and not for the dubious glory of enforcing on the world their respective personal hobbies—may be counted on the fingers of one hand: while legion is the name of the pretenders. In our day, reputations for learning seem to be built by suggestion on the hypnotic principle, rather than by real merit. The masses cower before him who imposes himself upon them: hence such a galaxy of men regarded as eminent in science, arts and literature; and if they are so easily accepted, it is precisely because of the gigantic self-opinionatedness and self-assertion of, at any rate, the majority of them. Once thoroughly analyzed, however, how many of such would remain who truly deserve the application of "wise" even in terrestrial wisdom? How many, we ask, of the so-called "authorities" and "leaders of men" would prove much better than those of whom it

was said—by one "wise" indeed—"they be blind leaders of the blind"? That the teachings of neither our modern teachers nor preachers are "wisdom from above" is fully demonstrated. It is proved not by any personal incorrectness in their statements or mistakes in life, for "to err is but human," but by incontrovertible facts. *Wisdom* and *Truth* are synonymous terms, and that which is false or pernicious cannot be *wise.* Therefore, if it is true, as we are told by a well-known representative of the Church of England, that the *Sermon on the Mount* would, in its practical application, mean utter ruin for his country in less than three weeks; and if it is no less true, as asserted by a literary critic of science, that "the knell of Charles Darwinism is rung in Mr. A. R. Wallace's present book,"* an event already predicted by Quatrefages—then we are left to choose between two courses. We have either to take both Theology and Science on blind faith and trust; or, to proclaim both untrue and untrustworthy. There is, however, a third course open: to *pretend that we believe in both at the same time,* and say nothing, as many do; but this would be sinning against Theosophy and pandering to the prejudices of Society—and that we refuse to do. More than this: we declare openly, *quand même,* that not one of the two, neither Theologist nor Scientist, has the right in the face of this to claim, the one that he preaches that which is divine inspiration, and the other—exact science; since the former enforces that, which is on his own recognition, pernicious to men and states—*i.e.,* the ethics of Christ; and the other (in the person of the eminent naturalist, Mr. A. R. Wallace, as shown by Mr. Samuel Butler) teaches Darwinian evolution, in which he believes no longer; a scheme, moreover, *which has never existed in nature,* if the opponents of Darwinism are correct.

Nevertheless, if anyone would presume to call "unwise" or "false" the world-chosen authorities, or declare their respective policies dishonest, he would find himself promptly reduced to silence. To doubt the exalted wisdom of the religion of the late Cardinal Newman, or of the Church of England, or again of our great modern scientists, is to sin against the Holy Ghost and Culture. Woe unto him who refuses to recognize the World's "Elect." He has to bow before one or the other, though, if one *is* true, the other *must* be false; and if the "wisdom" of neither Bishop nor Scientist is "from above"—which is pretty fairly

* See "The Deadlock of Darwinism", by Samuel Butler, in the *Universal Review* for April, 1890.

demonstrated by this time—then their "wisdom" is at best—"terrestrial, psychic, devilish."

Now, our readers have to bear in mind that nought of the above is meant as a sign of disrespect for the *true* teachings of Christ, of *true* science: nor do we judge personalities but only the systems of our civilized world. Valuing freedom of thought above all things as the only way of reaching at some future time that Wisdom, of which every Theosophist ought to be enamored, we recognize the right to the same freedom in our foes as in our friends. All we contend for is their claim to Wisdom—as we understand this term. Nor do we blame, but rather pity, in our innermost heart, the "wise men" of our age for trying to carry out the only policy that will keep them on the pinnacle of their "authority"; as they could not, if even they would, act otherwise and preserve their *prestige* with the masses, or escape from being speedily outcast by their colleagues. The party spirit is so strong with regard to the old tracks and ruts, that to turn on a side path means deliberate treachery to it. Thus, to be regarded now-a-days as an authority in some particular subject, the scientist has to reject *nolens volens* the metaphysical, and the theologian to show contempt for the materialistic teachings. All this is worldly policy and practical common sense, but it is not the *Wisdom* of either Job or James.

Shall it be then regarded as too far fetched, if, basing our words on a life-long observation and experience, we venture to offer our ideas as to the quickest and most efficient means of obtaining our present World's universal respect and becoming an "authority"? Show the tenderest regard for the corns of every party's hobbies, and offer yourself as the chief executioner, the hangman, of the reputations of men and things regarded as unpopular. Learn, that the great secret of power consists in the art of pandering to popular prejudices, to the World's likes and dislikes. Once this principal condition complied with, he who practises it is certain of attracting to himself the educated and their satellites—the less educated—they whose rule it is to place themselves invariably on the safe side of public opinion. This will lead to a perfect harmony of simultaneous action. For, while the favorite attitude of the cultured is to hide behind the intellectual bulwarks of the favorite leaders of scientific thought, and *jurare in verba magistri,* that of the less cultured is to transform themselves into the faithful, mechanical telephones of their superiors, and to repeat like well-trained parrots the

dicta of their immediate leaders. The now aphoristical precept of Mr. Artemus Ward, the showman of famous memory—"Scratch my back, Mr. Editor, and I will scratch yours"—proves immortally true. The "rising Star," whether he be a theologian, a politician, an author, a scientist, or a journalist—has to begin scratching the back of public tastes and prejudices—a hypnotic method as old as human vanity. Gradually the hypnotized masses begin to purr, they are ready for "suggestion." Suggest whatever you want them to believe, and forthwith they will begin to return your caresses, and purr now to your hobbies, and pander in their turn to anything suggested by theologian, politician, author, scientist, or journalist. Such is the simple secret of blossoming into an "authority" or a "leader of men"; and such is the secret of our modern-day wisdom.

And this is also the "secret" and the true reason of the *unpopularity* of *Lucifer* and of the ostracism practised by this same modern world on the Theosophical Society: for neither *Lucifer,* nor the Society it belongs to, has ever followed Mr. Artemus Ward's golden precept. No true Theosophist, in fact. would consent to become the fetish of a fashionable doctrine, any more than he would make himself the slave of a decaying dead-letter system, the spirit from which has disappeared for ever. Neither would he pander to anyone or anything, and therefore would always decline to show belief in that in which he does not, nor can he believe, which is lying to his own soul. Therefore there, where others see "the beauty and graces of modern culture," the Theosophist sees only moral ugliness and the somersaults of the clowns of the so-called cultured centres. For him nothing applies better to modern fashionable society than Sydney Smith's description of Popish ritualism: "Posture and imposture, flections and genuflections, bowing to the right, curtsying to the left, and an immense amount of male (and especially female) millinery." There may be, no doubt, for some worldly minds, a great charm in modern civilization; but for the Theosophist all its bounties can hardly repay for the evils it has brought on the world. These are so many, that it is not within the limits of this article to enumerate these offspring of culture and of the progress of physical science, whose latest achievements begin with vivisection and end in improved murder by electricity.

Our answer, we have no doubt, is not calculated to make us more friends than enemies, but this can be hardly helped. Our magazine may

be looked upon as "pessimistic," but no one can charge it with publishing slanders or lies, or, in fact, anything but that which we honestly believe to be true. Be it as it may, however, we hope never to lack moral courage in the expression of our opinions or in defence of Theosophy and its Society. Let then nine-tenths of every population arise in arms against the Theosophical Society wherever it appears—they will never be able to suppress the truths it utters. Let the masses of growing Materialism, the hosts of Spiritualism, all the Church-going congregations, bigots and iconoclasts, Grundy-worshippers, aping-followers and blind disciples, let them slander, abuse, lie, denounce, and publish every falsehood about us under the sun—they will not uproot Theosophy, nor even upset her Society, if only its members hold together. Let even such friends and *advisers* as he who is now answered, turn away in disgust from those whom he addresses in vain—it matters not, for our two paths in life run diametrically opposite. Let him keep to his "terrestrial" wisdom: we will keep to that pure ray "that comes from above," from the light of the "Ancient."

What indeed, has WISDOM, *Theosophia*—the Wisdom "full of mercy and good fruits, without wrangling or partiality and without hypocrisy" (James iii, 17)—to do with our cruel, selfish, crafty, and hypocritical world? What is there in common between divine Sophia and the improvements of modern civilization and science; between spirit and the letter that killeth? The more so as at this stage of evolution the wisest man on earth, according to the wise Carlyle, is "but a clever infant spelling letters from a hieroglyphical, prophetic book, the lexicon of which lies in *eternity*."

ON STUDYING THEOSOPHY

There must be within a man something which he already knows, that leaps up and out when he scans the books of wisdom; a thing already existing, which only takes an added life or confirmation from books. True Theosophy has all that is practical, but many forget this; there is no greater system of practice than that required by it.

—WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

MASTERS, ADEPTS, TEACHERS, AND DISCIPLES

THIS article is meant for members of the T.S., and chiefly for those who keep H.P.B. much in mind, whether out of respect and love or from fear and envy. Those members who believe that such beings as the Masters may exist must come to one of two conclusions in regard to H.P.B.: either that she invented her Masters, who therefore have no real existence, or that she did not invent them but spoke in the names and by the orders of such beings. If we say she invented the Mahatmas, then, of course, as so often was said by her, all that she has taught and written is the product of her own brain, from which we would be bound to conclude that her position on the roll of great and powerful persons must be higher than people have been willing to place her. But I take it most of us believe in the truth of her statement that she had those teachers whom she called Masters and that they are more perfect beings than ordinary men.

The case I wish to briefly deal with then, is this: H.P.B. and her relations to the Masters and to us; her books and teachings; the general question of disciples or chelas with their grades, and whether a high chela would appear as almost a Master in comparison to us, including every member from the President down to the most recent applicant.

The last point in the inquiry is extremely important, and has been much overlooked by members in my observation, which has extended over the larger part of the T.S. An idea has become quite general that chelas and disciples are all of one grade, and that therefore one chela is the same as another in knowledge and wisdom. The contrary, however, is the case. Chelas and disciples are of many grades, and some of the Adepts are themselves the chelas of higher Adepts. There is therefore the greatest difference between the classes of chelas, since among them has to be counted the very humblest and most ignorant person who has devoted himself or herself to the service of mankind and the pursuit of the knowledge of the Self. On the other hand, there are those chelas, high in grade, actual pupils of the Masters themselves, and these latter have so much knowledge and power as to seem to us to be Adepts. Indeed, they are such when one compares them with one-

---

NOTE.—This article was first published in the *Path* for June, 1893, and was last reprinted in THEOSOPHY for May, 1944.

self as a mere product of the nineteenth century. They have gained through knowledge and discipline those powers over mind, matter, space, and time which to us are the glittering prizes of the future. But yet these persons are not the Masters spoken of by H.P.B. So much being laid down, we may next ask how we are to look at H.P.B.

In the first place, everyone has the right to place her if he pleases for himself on the highest plane, because he may not be able to formulate the qualities and nature of those who are higher than she was. But taking her own sayings, she was a chela or disciple of the Masters, and therefore stood in relation to them as one who might be chided or reproved. She called them her Masters, and asseverated a devotion to their behests and a respect and confidence in and for their utterances which the chela has always for one who is high enough to be his Master. But looking at her powers exhibited to the world, and as to which one of her Masters wrote that they had puzzled and astonished the brightest minds of the age, we see that compared with ourselves she was an Adept. In private as in public she spoke of her Masters much in the same way as did Subba Row to the writer when he declared in 1884, "The Mahatmas are in fact some of the great Rishees and Sages of the past, and people have been too much in the habit of lowering them to the petty standard of this age." But with this reverence for her teachers she had for them at the same time a love and friendship not often found on earth. All this indicates her chelaship to Them, but in no way lowers her to us or warrants us in deciding that we are right in a hurried or modern judgment of her.

Now some Theosophists ask if there are other letters extant from her Masters in which she is called to account, is called their chela, and is chided now and then, besides those published. Perhaps yes. And what of it? Let them be published by all means, and let us have the full and complete record of all letters sent during her life; those put forward as dated after her death will count for naught in respect to any judgment passed on her, since the Masters do not indulge in any criticisms on the disciples who have gone from earth. As she has herself published letters and parts of letters from the Masters to her in which she is called a chela and is chided, it certainly cannot matter if we know of others of the same sort. For over against all such we have common sense, and also the declarations of her Masters that she was the sole instrument possible for the work to be done, that They sent her to do it, and that They

approved in general all she did. And she was the first direct channel to and from the Lodge, and the only one up to date through which came the objective presence of the Adepts. We cannot ignore the messenger, take the message, and laugh at or give scorn to the one who brought it to us. There is nothing new in the idea that letters are still unpublished wherein the Masters put her below them, and there is no cause for any apprehension. But it certainly is true that not a single such letter has anything in it putting her below us; she must ever remain the greatest of the chelas.

There only remains, then, the position taken by some and without a knowledge of the rules governing these matters, that chelas sometimes write messages claimed to be from the Masters when they are not. This is an artificial position not supportable by law or rule. It is due to ignorance of what is and is not chelaship, and also to confusion between grades in discipleship. It has been used as to H.P.B. The false conclusion has first been made that an accepted chela of high grade may become accustomed to dictation given by the Master and then may fall into the false pretense of giving something from himself and pretending it is from the Master. It is impossible. The bond in her case was not of such a character to be dealt with thus. One instance of it would destroy the possibility of any more communication from the teacher. It may be quite true that probationers now and then have imagined themselves as ordered to say so and so, but that is not the case of an accepted and high chela who is irrevocably pledged, nor anything like it. This idea, then, ought to be abandoned; it is absurd, contrary to law, to rule, and to what must be the case when such relations are established as existed between H.P.B. and her Masters.

Inviolability of Self

Logic demands the universal, and nature supplies nothing but the particular. The world, we know, has no exclusiveness. It contains everything, provides for everything, welcomes the ugly and the beautiful, the high and the low, the good and the bad. We human beings are not so broad-minded. We discriminate, we approve and disapprove. Nature exhibits no discrimination, neither likes nor dislikes.

—W. Macneile Dixon

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK— AND ANSWER

WE have to stand all tests alike—praise as well as blame. We should not be elated by praise or success, nor cast down by blame or failure, because either of these is an application of the 'personal idea' . . . . we should therefore do what we have to do, simply as duties, regardless of whether that performance brings us praise or blame," writes Robert Crosbie in The Friendly Philosopher. *But just how absolute in decision can we be expected to be in respect to those close to us, who are affected by our every action, when, they imply, performance of a duty as* we *see it, may bring us blame?*

(*a*) In all circumstances, it is important to find what our duty is, and then to do it.

But in a case where other people's feelings may be hurt by our action, we must weigh carefully all the factors, to find what our duty *really* is. Feelings are important, and, if possible, shouldn't be hurt, yet some feelings are of a personal nature, and so are not always the most important consideration—especially when the decision involves an ethical issue.

If we decide that we must perform an action in order to be true to ourselves, regardless of what blame it may bring from our friends, it is still not always necessary to hurt them. Talk it over with them; exchange views; try to show our reasoning; and if this fails, try at least to make them respect our *right* to make our own decisions. The chances are, if this is done, things will work out.

But if even this should fail, we must learn how to take without resentment the blame that comes. When people feel resentful towards each other, it sets up a double barrier—your resentment on top of theirs. But if we carry no resentment, and take the blame with equal-mindedness, it keeps the door open for them, so that if they should realize in the future that we were in the right, the last barrier between us is removed.

(*b*) This does indeed seem to be quite a problem, one never finally and definitely settled; for it involves our ability to perceive what our duty is, regardless of what another's conception of our duty may be. Everything about a man, if he is in a healthy state of mind, is in the process of constant growth—from attitudes and ideas held, to thinking pro-

cesses and conceptions of truth and duty. Thus, it is extremely difficult to know what formula one should use for discovering one's own duty, independent of the necessary interplay with others with whom we are closely identified, and their own lines of growth and expanding conceptions and opinions.

This appears doubly involved and complex when we are trying to correlate it with the fact that it is so terribly difficult, and so rarely achieved, to experience honest and mutually rewarding understanding and love between two human beings. As Erich Fromm points out in *The Art of Loving,* true, independent love is very rare in this world because it is most difficult for people to think in terms of *giving* rather than being *given to.* Therefore, if one is attempting to become a "full" person, one who is capable of loving—that is, of honest and understanding giving—it is a tremendous task in itself, without the additional task of remembering that we do our duties independently and alone. Perhaps a closer look at what is involved "in respect to those close to us" from Fromm's viewpoint will give us a clearer idea of what duty entails and "just how absolute in our decisions" we can be.

As was said, if we are of a philosophical frame of mind, we are constantly re-evaluating our conceptions and principles of figuring things out. Yet we all have innately a deep-rooted conception of moral obligation which embodies a perception of Universal Brotherhood. One does not change his sense of moral obligation, exactly—one enlarges it, or, if necessary, redirects it. Moral obligation would seem to involve the degree to which we feel identified with the theosophical principle of "the fundamental identity of all Souls with the Universal Over-Soul," and are not only willing to act in conformity, but also desire to do so.

To act in accord with the principle of the fundamental identity of all souls, one is constantly striving to see the truth in every situation and person through the exterior maze of the finite "bodies" and "personal" idiosyncrasies. Therefore, since praise and success or blame and failure are not the elements of truth in any instance or person, we mistake dreadfully if influenced by them to any great extent. The truth of an action or attitude held is not easily discernible.

Erich Fromm tells us that the ability to give love to our fellow beings involves this ever-present desire to discriminate truth from seeming truth; since it is only when this is devoutly undertaken that one learns just where his personality stands, what his "character" needs are, where

he is weak, etc.—all of which hinder, to some degree, his capacity to "freely give." If one has a fairly good idea of his own limitations, he will be able to deal with them consciously, better able to focus on what truth there is in any given relationship; for he will not be unconsciously seeking to gratify his own imagined needs or excuse his "failures." If, on the other hand, he does not try to honestly see himself for what he is and where he stands with himself, he is more likely than not to depend on the approval and praise of others for reassurance, because he is not offering the reassurance to himself through his own efforts to understand and rectify his deficiencies.

We are always in contact with truths and ideas via our rapport with other people. So it stands to reason that, depending upon our degree of respect and feeling of identity with a person, we will be more than somewhat interested in his reactions and ideas concerning our own ideas and choices. These reactions of others should not, nor can they really be, overlooked and shrugged off as completely incidental. Yet, undue attention to this aspect of one's *conception* of his moral obligation is misleading and offers no real workable substance to either party.

To be interested and somewhat influenced by what those close to us think about what we do is not entirely "silly," of course. We desire harmony, union, with others. Erich Fromm also writes that "the desire for interpersonal fusion is the most powerful striving in man. It is the most fundamental passion, it is the force which keeps the human race together, the clan, the family, society." If a person does not feel union with another, be it in the art of teaching others, on the level of philosophical sharing of ideas and conceptions, the man-woman relationship, or whatever, he may never learn how to give of his best *of* himself to another's needs. Thus, we *naturally* find ourselves in the position of being involved with others' conceptual values of "good" and "evil" as well as our conceptions, and wanting to synthesize. But false syntheses are no good.

The problem is not so much whether we should be affected or feel another's approval or disapproval, but on the level of the approval or disapproval; whether it involves some "personal" idea, or whether it concerns conceptions of justice and truth. We should disagree only with sorrow, when we must, yet know that final "harmony or union" with anyone requires each to stand alone at times—after which an even greater understanding may be possible.

SOME THOUGHTS ON UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD

THE word "universal," like many other words, has an extended meaning when used in a theosophical context; when coupled with "Brotherhood" both words have great significance to the theosophist. For many, at least, Universal Brotherhood refers only to the human race, and its application is usually limited to some kind of "tolerance." To the theosophist it means a relationship based on unity in diversity, and takes in all forms in which Life is represented—mineral, vegetable, animal and human. *The Bhagavad-Gita,* in speaking of Brahma, the Supreme Spirit, says, "It is within and without all creatures animate and inanimate; it is inconceivable because of its subtlety, and although near it is afar off. Although undivided it appeareth as divided among creatures." Another theosophical saying, "Life sustains all forms requiring life," indicates not only the universality in essence of all beings, but also the universal interdependence existing between all units of life, in which the one Spirit is the unitary basis of existence, although, because of its presence in all forms, it may appear as divided.

Many who cogitate upon the idea of Universal Brotherhood have learned to think of their fellow creatures "objectively," a habit of thought engendered by the materialism of science and religion in our day and race. Even this limited practice will help to bring out the similarity of thought, will, and feeling among human beings, beyond the limitations of racial peculiarities, though it will fail to show that which Theosophy teaches, namely, that unity in spirit, rather than similarity of thought, will, and feeling, is the true basis of all our relationships, human and otherwise. One of our Teachers has suggested that we use the thought, "That, too, is *myself,*" when considering or evaluating any being. This is good theosophical practice, and many who have used it, or similar suggestions and aids, have found that it has added to their stock of patience, tolerance, and understanding. When such ideas are related to the Three Fundamentals of the Secret Doctrine, we find the idea of Universal Brotherhood expanded: One Life, One Law and one Process of continuous development, in which all units of Life partake and in which each unit aids or retards the prog-

ress of all other units. "That, too, is myself," is easy to apply to things or persons which are pleasant to us, not so easy when we seek to apply the idea to those which are repulsive. Yet, to be true to the teachings and ourselves we must apply the thought alike to Sage or beetle, and when we use the unlimited application we find it easier to apply it to ourselves and the family next door. Thus, when we focus upon the essential nature rather than the externalities, we begin to find identity existing where only similarity existed before.

Christians and others speak of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, but there the application is to that of nothing more than a large family, failing to develop the idea of Identity. "I and my Father are One," does not carry to the religionist the same meaning it does to the theosophist. The use of the personal pronouns referring to God in the Christian scriptures has done much to further the false conception of a personal god entertained by many sincere but uninformed minds. True, some of the older scriptures, such as *The Bhagavad-Gita,* employ the personal pronoun, but these writings were directed to a people who were accustomed to that form of symbolic imagery, and to them the words conveyed no notion of a single symbolic personal god.

If we would consider Universal Brotherhood from the theosophical viewpoint, we must apply to it the idea of continuing relationships as expressed in the teachings of reincarnation and karma. Thus, although our personal and objective relationships may change from time to time and from incarnation to incarnation, our essential identity carries us through all changes and is the basis from which our evolution proceeds.

When, proceeding along these lines from universals to particulars, we find our problems in dealing with individuals and races lessening in intensity, it is because we are learning to evaluate from the basis of identity rather than that of diversity, while still recognizing that external differentiations are necessary for the evolution of the individual. Many of the differences we note are either the result of lack of experience, or they are karmic setbacks—or promotions. So, when we say, "That, too, is myself," we must apply it not only to the present circumstances, but also to the continuing being whose identity is that of "myself." If we attempt to ponder on the nature of a Mahatma, we might think that as he is I may—or must—become. And, in considering the case of an aboriginal savage we could think that as he is today, I was yesterday, and all the while we are One. To the theosophist the ideas of racial

segregation or discrimination are abhorrent because they emphasize externalities instead of essentials.

Those who have some measure of success in dealing with individuals of other races succeed because they have found points of common interest. Those who are most successful are those who have learned to treat with their fellow men of all races and conditions from the basis of Soul. To do this, in spite of the artificial conventionalities which often surround us, may require fortitude. An English author relates the case of an Englishman resident in India, not so long ago, who was ostracized by the members of the British colony because he had committed an unpardonable sin, "He sat down in the market place!" Quite probably, by sitting down in the market place, he learned many worth-while things that were beyond the ken of his haughty compeers. It is a hopeful sign that, with increasing facilities for travel, people of many races are discovering the similarity of thought, will, and feeling which exists among all races, and we hear less and less of the insults and indignities which "superior" persons were wont to inflict upon "foreigners," and even members of armies of occupation appear to be somewhat more tolerant.

We cannot break down or do away with the natural differences between races. Each race, and each individual member of it, is exactly what and where it is as the result of karmic evolution. To deny to any man the rights and privileges which are inherently his may not only retard his evolution, but our own as well. Conversely, those who aid the progress of the less-progressed are furthering their own evolution and may have the satisfaction that comes from deeds well done. There will be no problems of segregation and discrimination when mankind realizes that the relationship of each being to all other beings is not a matter of consanguinity or affinity, but of Spiritual Identity. "That, too, is myself!"

OUR DIVINE PROGENITORS

OF all the seven great divisions of Dhyan Chohans, there is none with which humanity is more concerned than with the *Kumaras.* Imprudent are the Christian theologians who have degraded them into fallen angels, and now call them "Satan" and demons, as among these heavenly denizens who *refuse to create*, the Archangel Michael—the great patron Saint of Western and Eastern Churches—under his double name of St. Michael and his supposed copy on earth, St. George conquering the DRAGON—has to be allowed one of the most prominent places. "The *Kumaras,*" explains an esoteric text, "are the Dhyanis, derived from the supreme Principle, who reappear in the Vaivaswattha Manu period, for the progress of mankind." They may indeed mark a "special" or extra *creation,* since it is they who, by incarnating themselves within the senseless human shells of the first two root-races, and a great portion of the third root-race—create, so to speak, a *new race*: that of thinking, self-conscious and *divine man.* They are the PROGENITORS of the true spiritual Self in the physical man—the *higher* Prajapati (progenitors). While the Pitris, or *lower* Prajapati, are no more than the fathers of the model, or type of his physical form, made "in their image."

Esoteric doctrine teaches that the Dhyan Chohans (*Kumaras*) are the collective aggregate of divine Intelligences or primordial *mind,* and that the first Manus—the seven "mind-born" Spiritual Intelligences—are identical with the former. The God in man—and often the incarnation of a God—is a highly spiritual Dhyan Chohan in him, besides the presence of his own seventh principle. To this hierarchy of Dhyan Chohans correspond the actual types into which humanity may be divided; for humanity, as a whole, is in reality a materialized though as yet very imperfect expression thereof. The pure, celestial Being (Dhyan Chohan) and the great Pitris of various classes were commissioned—the one to evolve their images (*Chhaya*), and make of them physical man, the others to inform and thus endow him with divine intelligence and the comprehension of the *Mysteries of Creation.* Mankind, *psychically* considered, is divided into various groups, each of which is connected with one of the Dhyanic groups that first formed *psychic* man.

NOTE.—Collated from *The Secret Doctrine.*

What is human mind in its higher aspect, whence comes it, if it is not a portion of the essence—and, in some rare cases of incarnation, the *very essence*—of a higher Being; one from a higher and divine plane? Can man—a god in the animal form—be the product of material Nature by evolution alone, even as is the animal, which differs from man in external shape, but by no means in the materials of its physical fabric, and is informed by the *same though undeveloped* Monad—seeing that the intellectual potentialities of the two differ as the Sun does from the glow-worm? And what is it that creates such a difference, unless man is an animal *plus a living god* within his physical shell? Let us pause and ask ourselves seriously the question, regardless of the vagaries and sophisms of both the materialistic and the psychological modern sciences.

Man is not, nor could he ever be, the complete product of the "Lord God." But he *is* the child of the *Elohim* (the lower Dhyan Chohans), so arbitrarily changed into the singular masculine gender. The first Dhyanis, commissioned to "create" man in their image, could only throw off their shadows, like a delicate model for the nature spirits of matter to work upon. Man is, beyond any doubt, formed *physically* out of the dust of the Earth. *But his creators and fashioners were many.* The Sons of Wisdom, or the *spiritual* Dhyanis, had become "intellectual" through their contact with matter, because they had already reached, during previous cycles of incarnation, that degree of intellect which enabled them to become independent and self-conscious entities, *on this plane* of matter. They were reborn only by reason of Karmic effects. They *entered* those who were "ready," and became the Arhats, or sages.

Every sentence taught in ancient cosmogonies, unfolds to him who can read between the lines the identity of the ideas, though under different garb. The first lesson taught in Esoteric philosophy is, that the incognizable Cause does not put forth evolutions, whether consciously or unconsciously, but only exhibits periodically *different aspects of itself* to the perception of *finite* minds. Now the collective Mind—the Universal—composed of various and numberless Hosts of Creative Powers, however infinite in manifested Time, is still finite when contrasted with the unborn and undecaying Space in its supreme essential aspect. Man, unable to form one concept except in terms of empirical phenomena, is powerless from the very constitution of his

being to raise the veil that shrouds the majesty of the Absolute. Only the *liberated* Spirit is able to faintly realize the nature of the source whence it sprung and whither it must eventually return. . . . We are taught that the highest Dhyan Chohans, or Planetary Spirits (beyond the cognizance of the law of analogy), are in ignorance of what lies beyond the visible planetary systems, since their essence cannot assimilate itself to that of worlds beyond our solar system. When they reach a higher stage of evolution these other universes will be open to them; meanwhile they have complete knowledge of all the worlds within and beneath the limits of our solar system.

The whole Kosmos is guided, controlled, and animated by almost endless series of Hierarchies of sentient Beings, each having a mission to perform, and who—whether we give to them one name or another, and call them Dhyan Chohans or Angels—are "messengers" in the sense only that they are the agents of Karmic and Cosmic Laws. They are "Living Ones," because they are the streams projected on the Kosmic screen of illusion from the ABSOLUTE LIFE; beings in whom life cannot become extinct, before the fire of ignorance is extinct in those who sense these "Lives." The day when "the spark will re-become the Flame (man will merge into his Dhyan Chohan) myself and others, thyself and me," as the Stanza (vii) has it, means this: In Paranirvana—when Pralaya will have reduced not only material and psychic bodies, but even the spiritual Ego(s) to their original principle—the Past, Present, and even Future Humanities, like all things, will be one and the same. Everything will have re-entered the *Greath Breath.*

A Dhyan Chohan has to become one. He cannot be born or appear suddenly on the plane of life as a full-blown angel. There are seven chief groups of such Dhyan Chohans, which will be found and recognized in every religion, for they are the primeval SEVEN Rays. Humanity, occultism teaches us, is divided into seven distinct groups and their sub-divisions, mental, spiritual and physical. Hence the seven chief planets, the *spheres* of the indwelling seven spirits, under each of which is born one of the human groups which is guided and influenced thereby. The philosophy of psychic, spiritual, and mental relations with man's physical functions is in almost inextricable confusion. Neither the old Aryan, nor the Egyptian psychology is now properly understood. Nor can they be assimilated without accepting the exoteric septenary, or, at any rate, the Vedantin quinquepartite division of the hu-

man inner principles. Failing which, it will be for ever impossible to understand the metaphysical and purely psychic and even physiological relations between the Dhyan Chohans, or Angels, on the one plane, and humanity on the other. . . . Like alone produces like. The Earth gives Man his body, the gods (Dhyanis) his five inner principles, the psychic Shadow, of which those gods are often the animating principle. SPIRIT (Atman) is one—and indiscrete. There was a time when the whole world was "of one lip and one knowledge," and Man knew more of his origin than he does now, and thus knew that the Sun and Moon, however large a part they do play in the constitution, growth and development of the human body, were not the direct causative agents of his appearance on Earth; these agents being, in truth, the living and intelligent Powers which the occultists call Dhyan Chohans.

Like each of the seven regions of the Earth, each of the seven First-born (the primordial human groups) receives its light and life from its own especial Dhyani—spiritually, and from the palace (house, the planet) of that Dhyani, physically. So with the seven great Races to be born on it. So with man and every "man" in man (every principle). Each gets its specific quality from its primary (the planetary spirit). Therefore every man is a septenate, or a combination of principles, each having its origin in a quality of that special Dhyani. Every active power or force of the earth comes to her from one of the seven Lords. Light comes through Venus, who receives a triple supply, and gives one-third of it to the Earth. . . . The Regent (of the planet) Sukra (Venus) loved his adopted child (Earth) so well that he incarnated as Usanas and gave it perfect laws, which were disregarded and rejected in later ages. It is with its Regent, the informing Dhyan Chohan, that Occult mysticism has to deal. Venus, or Lucifer (also Sukra and Usanas) the planet, is the light-bearer of our Earth, in both its physical and mystic sense.

The Secret Doctrine teaches *history*—which, for being esoteric and traditional, is none the less more reliable than profane history. And the Doctrine says that the Dhyani-Buddhas of the two higher groups, namely, the "Watchers" or the "Architects," furnish the many and various races with divine kings and leaders. It is the latter who taught humanity their arts and sciences, and the former who revealed to the incarnated Monads that had just shaken off their vehicles of the lower Kingdoms—and who had, therefore, lost every recollection of their

divine origin—the great spiritual truths of the transcendental worlds. Since traditions and even Chronicles of such dynasties of *divine* Kings —of gods reigning over men followed by dynasties of Heroes or Giants —exist in the annals of every nation, it is difficult to understand how all the peoples under the sun, some of whom are separated by vast oceans and belong to other hemispheres, such as the ancient Peruvians and Mexicans, as well as the Chaldeans, could have worked out the same "fairy tales" in the same order of events. It must be explained and remembered that, as the work of each Round is said to be apportioned to a different group of so-called "Creators" or "Architects," so is that of every globe; *i.e.,* it is under the supervision and guidance of special "Builders" and "Watchers"—the various Dhyan Chohans.

Man in the first Round and first Race on Globe D, our Earth, was an ethereal being (a Lunar Dhyani, as man), non-intelligent but superspiritual; and correspondingly, on the law of analogy, in the first race of the fourth round. In each of the subsequent races and sub-races . . . he grows more and more into an encased or incarnate being. The Humanity of our Earth develops fully only in the fourth—our present Round. Man, philosophically considered, is, in his outward form, simply an animal, hardly more perfect than his pithecoid-like ancestors of the third Round. He is a living body, not a living being, since the realization of existence, the "Ego-Sum," necessitates self-consciousness, and an animal can have only direct consciousness, or instinct. It is only when, from a potential androgyne, man has become separated into male and female, that he will be endowed with his conscious, rational, individual Soul (*Manas*), "the principle, or the intelligence, of the [higher] Elohim," to receive which, he has to eat of the fruit of Knowledge from the Tree of Good and Evil.

It is only the knowledge of the constant rebirths of one and the same individuality throughout the life-cycle; the assurance that the same MONADS—among whom are many Dhyan Chohans, or the "Gods" themselves—have to pass through the "Circle of Necessity," rewarded or punished by such rebirth for the suffering endured or crimes committed in the former life; that those very Monads, which entered the empty, senseless shells, or astral figures of the first race emanated by the Pitris, are the same who are now amongst us—nay, ourselves, perchance: it is only this doctrine, we say, that can explain to us the mysterious problem of Good and Evil, and reconcile man to the terrible

and *apparent* injustice of life. Nothing but such certainty can quiet our revolted sense of justice. For, when one unacquainted with the noble doctrine looks around him, and observes the inequalities of birth and fortune, of intellect and capacities; when one sees honour paid fools and profligates, on whom fortune has heaped her favours by mere privilege of birth, and their nearest neighbour, with all his intellect and noble virtues—far more deserving in every way—perishing for want and for lack of sympathy; when one sees all this and has to turn away, helpless to relieve the undeserved sufferings, one's ears ringing and heart aching with the cries of pain around him—that blessed knowledge of Karma alone prevents him from cursing life and men, as well as their supposed Creator.

It is not in the course of natural law that man should become a *perfect* septenary being, before the seventh race in the seventh Round. Yet he has all these principles in him from his birth. Nor is it part of the evolutionary law that the Fifth principle (*Manas*), should receive its complete development before the *Fifth* Round. . . . This limitation, however, refers solely to the spiritual development. The intellectual, on the physical plane, was reached by him during the fourth root-race.

During the three Rounds to come, Humanity, like the globe on which it lives, will be ever tending to reassume its primeval form, that of a Dhyan Chohanic host. Man tends to become *a* God and then—God, like every other atom in the Universe. The Celestial Hierarchy of the present Manvantara will find itself transferred in the next cycle of life into higher, superior worlds, and will make room for a new hierarchy, composed of the elect ones of mankind.

Symbolism of Greek Gods

What we mean by religion is something which concerns the relation of the soul to God; the sense of sin, for example, and of repentance and grace. The religion of the Greeks, we may admit, did something for them which our religion does not do for us. It gave intelligible and beautiful form to those phenomena of nature which we can only describe as manifestations of energy; it expressed in a ritual of exquisite art those corporate relations which we can only enunciate in abstract terms.

—G. Lowes Dickinson

THEOSOPHICAL PSYCHOLOGY

ONE dictionary definition of psychology is, "The science which treats of the mind in its various aspects, stages and conditions." Some older dictionaries define psychology as the science which treats of the soul.

We know of no words which are abused and misused so commonly as mind, soul and spirit. With modern psychology, the soul ceased to be the exclusive property of religion and entered the field of speculative science—quite frequently under other names because of the failure of religion to distinguish between the various uses of the words soul, mind, and spirit. Popular religions of the Western world teach that man has a soul and that God is a spirit, while modern psychology tries by experimental methods to name and classify the powers and attributes of the mind, or, as some prefer, of the soul. While the experimental science of modern psychology has uncovered some items which might, if properly related, give a clue to the nature of the soul and its powers, much that is so studied should be called "psycho-physiology" rather than psychology. As is usual with any form of experimental science, more attention is given to the recording and classification of observed effects than to the occult causes and the laws under which they operate. Again, as usual, Theosophy is at variance with both religion and science in such matters. We offer, as propositions, some items from the teachings of Theosophy for consideration.

Unlike the deductive methods of modern science, the teachings of Theosophy are brought out by the Platonic method of reasoning from universals to particulars. The emanation of Spirit and Matter from the Unknowable is the basis from which the consideration of theosphical psychology begins. And here we find the great difference between theosophical psychology and modern academic psychology.

The teachings of Theosophy, dealing with unity rather than separateness, reject the idea that man "has" a soul and that God is "a" spirit, and state that Man *is* a soul, and that the *collectivity* of souls is what we call Spirit—a term practically ignored by science, and which has become anthropomorphized by religion into the personal god. Theosophy refuses to separate Man from his origin, and therefore teaches that this one undivided spirit is the deific essence of each and every being in

all grades of evolution and in every form of matter. It should be easy to see that if this basis were to be adopted, even as a proposition, by a substantial number of the disciples of modern psychology, their experiments would take a different turn—such as has taken place in the minds of those who use the idea as the foundation of theosophical psychology. And, by the way, this was exactly the basis used by H.P.B. in her great works, *Isis Unveiled* and *The Secret Doctrine,* the former prefaced by the statement that it was designed, "To break the moulds of men's minds and open them to an understanding of the truth," and the latter offered as corroborative evidence.

The term "psychology" seems to have a fascination for certain minds, and occasionally someone with a background of questionable psychological study will come into a theosophical assembly and ask questions based on the ideas he holds. He wants to know if Theosophy can teach him how to practice telepathy, psychometry, hypnotism, and mind-reading, or how to name playing cards placed face down, how to influence people in his own behalf, how to overcome his inhibitions, how to improve his health by mental effort, or how to become a better salesman. Such a person is usually disappointed to learn that not only does theosophy not teach how to do these things, but actually inveighs against most of them as forms of psychism rather than true psychology—so he goes away mentally labeling Theosophy "impractical." For him, as for all others who would use the hidden powers latent in man for personal gain, Theosophy *is* impractical. Nevertheless, there is such a thing as theosophical psychology and it is most "practical" indeed.

Blindly optimistic is the man who sees in the present era of material prosperity the true fulfillment of man's ambitions, and who works for the continuance and expansion of conditions brought about by the types of selfish competition which have made such conditions possible. Truly optimistic is the student of Theosophy who knows what the results of present conditions will be and who is preparing himself, by learning from present conditions how to meet the future, to encourage others to do the same. That is Theosophical Psychology as taught by all the Great Teachers. Always, in times of prosperity as in times of adversity, voices have been heard pointing out the truth. Jesus said, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these my brethren ye have done it unto me," referring not to himself as a man but to the indwelling spirit in each being. W.Q.J. has said, "Man is a spiritual being, and, as such,

stands among material things"; and Theosophy encourages us to "act for and as the Self, *the Self of all creatures,*" which is not a platitude but a statement of natural law. Gandhi attempted to put such ideas into practice among his people, and his words still find an echo both at home and abroad, even though opposed by the efforts of those who would put into effect a greater industrialization among "backward nations" and profit by the sale of machinery to replace manual labor. Is it strange, as witnessed by many travelers, that the finest examples of true brotherliness are found among the so-called backward peoples?

Our race is capable of understanding great truths, but is loth to put them into practice for fear of losing its cherished possessions. We hear, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" but we do not really believe it. And yet it is true, theosophically if not theologically. There is something in the mind of each one of us which recognizes such ideas, and we know we must some day learn to conform to natural law, but, in an attempt to compromise and hold on to part, if not all of what we have, we take half-way measures. We think of reduction of tariffs rather than abolition of tariffs, we speak of limitation of armament instead of total disarmament, we work for interracial understanding rather than interracial harmony; and many nations profess to work for international co-operation—within the limits which each nation sets! But since, as a race, we will not act on the basis of One Life, One Law, and One Process of mutual interdependence, we are setting up a series of causes which will *make* us think and act along those lines when the proper time comes. The proper time has arrived for those students of Theosophy who know the real meaning of cause and effect and who are willing to try to use the teachings and project the ideas into the minds of others.

To accept the idea that we are all One in spiritual essence and to make practical use of that idea would mean a genuine revolution in human thought and action among individuals, families, nations and races, the abandonment of competition as a means of survival and the recognition of co-operation as a necessity in the furtherance of Universal Brotherhood. If, as a *race,* we are as yet unready or unwilling to take such a step, those individuals who "see the necessity" may constitute "the nucleus of Universal Brotherhood" which H.P.B. labored to establish. "Help Nature and work on with her; and Nature will regard thee as one of her creators and make obeisance." That is Theosophical Psychology.

THE MANY-FACED HERO

SOMEWHERE on the pilgrimage of the soul, there must be a stage where the ego will voluntarily abandon the protection of the religion, social customs and traditional institutions it has been relying on; a point where it will strike off at a tangent from the orbit it has been following so long, and will start looking for the adventure that Joseph Campbell's "Hero" invariably and inevitably encounters.

We find a multitude of myths, legends, fables and parables from every quarter of the globe, based on the adventure of this Hero. From the South Sea Islands to the frozen North, from California to the Congo, we find an underlying identity of teaching in folklore. It is symbolized by the Hero who slays the dragon or conquers the demons or overcomes some other obstacle. As Campbell points out, if the Hero is ready and prepared for this test, he conquers easily and completely, and comes back to mankind as a teacher, messenger, or avatar. But if the attempt is made before the adventurer is prepared, he usually fails: he may even forfeit his life, and have to wait until another incarnation to try again.

Somewhere along the line, the pilgrim who is in earnest will finally become dissatisfied with partial truths, and may get so reckless and desperate that he goes at the search in a win-lose-or-draw, do-or-die, spirit. He wants the truth at whatever cost. Apparently, the distinction between what the Zen Buddhists call the "slow-" and the "quick-witted" disciple is that the one is still satisfied with the partial truths of the lesser vehicle (or else he lacks the courage and daring to break his traditional ties), while the other has outgrown these ties and teachings and is ready for the "sudden awakening." He tosses fear and caution out the window; for him it is all or nothing.

Mr. Judge says, and it would seem to be Joseph Campbell's view also, that the Hero, in leaving the protection of his traditional institutions and daring to trespass into the realm of opposing forces, inevitably arouses dark "dwellers of the threshold." If the pilgrim has the courage to make the attempt, he can depend on a challenge. In *The Voice of the Silence,* we are told "the more one dares the more he shall obtain." Yet it is indeed a good idea to take an accurate inventory of our weaknesses before precipitating this struggle.

The earnest student may wonder: how am I to know when I am ready for this adventure? It seems highly probable that he will never definitely *know* beforehand. Arjuna thought he was ready, but when he got things started and saw what was involved, he wanted to back out. He dug up all sorts of plausible excuses to support his contention that the struggle should be given up. But his Higher Self pointed out that these excuses seemed valid only from the limited viewpoint of the personal self.

The objectives of the lower self, as well as its most brilliant reasoning, are inadequate to aid the pilgrim who has reached the higher altitudes through which the pilgrimage leads. When this stage is reached, and our traditional guides are left behind, perhaps intuitional flashes from the Higher Self will furnish a brighter light by which to see.

MYSTERIES OF CREATION

Suppose an Occultist were to claim that the first grand organ of a cathedral had come originally into being in the following manner. First, there was a progressive and gradual elaboration in Space of an organizable material, which resulted in the production of a state of matter named *organic* PROTEIN. Then, under the influence of incident forces, those states having been thrown into a phase of unstable equilibrium, they slowly and majestically evolved into and resulted in new combinations of carved and polished wood, of brass pins and staples, of leather and ivory, wind-pipes and bellows. After which, having adapted all its parts into one harmonious and symmetrical machine, the organ suddenly pealed forth Mozart's *Requiem.* This was followed by a Sonata of Beethoven, etc., *ad infinitum;* its keys playing of themselves and the wind blowing into the pipes by its own inherent force and fancy. What would Science say to such a theory? Yet, it is precisely in such wise that the materialistic *savants* tell us that the Universe was formed, with its millions of beings, and man, its spiritual crown.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

ON THE LOOKOUT

Devotee of Philosophical Scrutiny

If one were to summarize the career of Dr. Curt J. Ducasse, the above words would recommend themselves as most fitting. Professor Ducasse's *Philosophical Scrutiny of Religion,* an excellent reference book for Theosophical students, is to be followed by the retired Brown Univrsity professor's "Philosophical Scrutiny" of beliefs concerning an after-life.

Now seventy-seven, but still an active researcher and a prolific writer, Dr. Ducasse has displayed more interest in the theory of reincarnation than any other academic figure. His *Nature, Mind and Death* concluded with a survey of the implications of reincarnation, and provided discussion of the conventional objections raised—none of which seemed to him very impressive.

Dr. Ducasse's final retirement from Brown University, after years as chairman of the Philosophy Department and as Acting Dean of the Graduate School, brought a lengthy story in the Providence *Evening Bulletin* for June 26. From this account it is clear that Dr. Ducasse has long been working at many phases of investigation pursued by Theosophists, and for similar reasons.

"Probes Great Beyond"

Selig Greenberg, writing for the *Bulletin,* chose this title to highlight one of Dr. Ducasse's unorthodox interests. Ducasse has conversed with mediums and psychics and attended séances in order to have some first-hand experience of the evidence cited by many as proof of an "after-life." To Mr. Greenberg, Dr. Ducasse remarked:

> The argument that death must extinguish the mind, since all of its manifestations then cease, ignores altogether the considerable amount of evidence to the contrary, gathered over many years and carefully checked by the Society of Psychical Research. Such evidence includes numerous well-authenticated cases of apparitions of dead persons and some remarkable cases of communications, purporting to come from the dead and made through mediums, who appear to possess a special gift of receptivity.

But Dr. Ducasse does *not* regard séance phenomena as impressive evidence for continued life after death in that form. Rather, he feels,

the concept of the plurality of lives seems in accord with man's instinctive conceptions of rationality and justice.

"Coherently Thinkable"

He continues:

> Whether or not survival as plurality of lives on earth is a fact, it is at least coherently thinkable and not incompatible with any facts known to us today.
>
> Of all the conceptions of the significance of human life on earth the reincarnation hypothesis, which regards each life of a person as being like a day in school, is the only one that makes any sense.
>
> How come one person is born a genius and another a boob; one is born beautiful and another ugly; one is born healthy and another crippled? The concept of rebirth on earth, perhaps after an interval occupied by the individual in distilling out of memories of a life just ended such wisdom as his reflective powers enabled him to extract, would enable us to believe there is justice in the universe.

Third Object of T.S.

Dr. Ducasse, then, has apparently investigated psychic phenomena largely as a means for unsettling conventional opinion—precisely the reason given by H. P. Blavatsky for her extensive writing on spiritualistic subjects. As Ducasse puts it: "So many people are hemmed in by tacit beliefs and disbeliefs, by conformities and the things they take for granted, that they shut their eyes to the fact that the material world is not the whole of this world and that there are apparently dimensions of nature as yet unknown and unexplored."

It is also significant that Dr. Ducasse's experiments with hypnotism led him to question the ethics of such practice. In Mr. Greenberg's account:

> Many years ago, Dr. Ducasse was quite an adept practitioner of hypnotism. It was fun, he recalled, when he put his friends under an hypnotic spell and told them, for instance, that their chairs were red hot, whereupon they would jump up in alarm. Once he informed a hypnotized friend that he would sneeze twice at breakfast next morning. And, sure enough, the fellow did just that. In another instance he even found that he could hypnotize an associate over the telephone. He gave up hypnotism upon deciding that its power of suggestion was too potent and might be misused.

As Mr. Greenberg's story makes evident, Dr. Ducasse is a philosopher who has seen the world. No doctrinaire "reincarnationist," he never-

theless gives the statement of reincarnation *philosophy* its most impressive academic form. Now released from teaching and administrative burdens, he will doubtless continue in his future work to develop variations on this "lost chord" of Western philosophy.

Sleep Monitoring

"Let none awake him that sleeps; for he is hard to heal, if the soul returns not to him." This is the Upanishadic injunction which some modern dream-investigators can hardly be said to obey. Nevertheless, that some interesting discoveries are being made through laboratory techniques about "common" dreaming is shown by Robert O'Brien's article in *Life* for May 5—"Almost Everybody Has Dreams Every Night." Mr. O'Brien summarizes the work of a group of researchers headed by Dr. Nathaniel Kleitman, professor of physiology at the University of Chicago. (Dr. Kleitman, familiarly referred to as "Dr. Sleep," has gained an international reputation for his work in this field.)

These scientists learned that when a person dreams his eyes move rapidly, following the motions of the dream, while during other periods of sleep only a slow rolling motion has been detected. When the rapid eye-movements were observed, through the aid of sensitive instruments attached to the brain, eyes, and heart, the sleeper was aroused and immediately dictated his dream into a recording machine. Says *Life*:

> Every night every subject showed the rapid eye movements indicative of dreaming. Out of 191 awakenings during these periods, dreams were reported 152 times, an approximate 80% incidence of dream recall. In 160 awakenings in the absence of rapid eye movements, failure of dream recall was logged 149 times, or approximately 15 times out of every 16.

This indicated that people who say they never dream simply do not recall their dreams. H. P. Blavatsky, sixty-nine years ago, made the following reply to the question, "Are there people who have never dreamed?":

> There is no such man in the world so far as I am aware. All dream more or less; only with most, dreams vanish suddenly upon waking. This depends on the more or less receptive condition of the brain ganglia. . . . The dream state is common not only to all men, but also to all animals, of course, from the highest mammalia to the smallest birds, and even insects. Every being endowed with a physical brain, or organs approximating thereto, must dream. (*Transactions*, p. 70.)

Other experiments yielded theories of dream duration. Dr. Kleitman is convinced that dreams usually consume as much time as they would if acted out in real life, although the dreamer can compress and elude time, handling it as writers handle it in novels and plays. "Technicolor" dreams were found to be extremely rare; people on waking are apt to "color up" their dream when relating it to others.

"A Pattern of Crest-and-Trough"

Another important conclusion derived from Dr. Kleitman's investigations is that dreaming takes place several times a night, but in only one particular stage of sleep. The timing may vary among individuals, but the flow of cycles, the pattern of crest-and-trough in the varying depth of sleep and occurrence of dreams, applies to everyone. The pattern goes like this, states Mr. O'Brien:

> In an average healthy night of rest we drift little by little to the brink of sleep. Reveries come and trail off. Images—flashing lights, perhaps, or faces—appear, waver like reflections in moving water and vanish. But there is no organized dream. We are not yet quite asleep. All at once we slide over the edge and down into our deepest slumber. We remain there not for two hours, as tradition has it, but for something like 30 minutes. Then we make a rising approach to our lightest phase of sleep and reach it about 70 minutes after falling asleep. This light phase is the time in which we dream. We seldom, if ever, dream in any other stage of sleep.
>
> The first time we attain this phase, we remain in it on an average of nine minutes. We dream our first dream of the night. Then we fall back into a trough of deeper sleep, though not so deep as before. Toward the middle of the third hour we are back at the crest for about 19 minutes more of dreaming. We return later for a third dream passage of about 24 minutes. The next period of dreaming occurs toward the onset of the seventh hour. This time we dream for 28 minutes or more. If we sleep through this period, we can count on perhaps another half-hour of medium slumber. Then we drift upward once more to the crest and remain there dreaming until we awake.

Four "Rounds" of Sleep

Thus, in eight hours of continuous sleep, the average person appears to spend about an hour-and-a-half in dreaming, and undergoes at least four complete rounds of cyclic sleep. The word "rounds" is used advisedly as the foregoing description of the sleep cycle appears to be a replica in miniature of the evolution of monadic life through the various rounds as taught in theosophical cosmogony. Briefly that teaching

is: Life passes from the plane of spirit to matter and back again in seven great waves or rounds of manifestation, each round beginning and ending in spirit after consciousness has expressed itself through all the intervening states. In the Fourth, our present Round, the densest degree of substance is reached. Correspondently, it would appear natural that in the nightly sleep-dreaming cycle, it is in the fourth "round" that we find ourselves awake on this plane. The fact that as the night progresses the periods of dreaming gradually lengthen, while the reverse process is occurring with respect to the quality and duration of the deep-sleep condition, is highly suggestive of the soul's "final" descent into the grossest phase of material existence.

In the treatment of the sleep states as given by the Theosophical Teachers, time particulars were not gone into, though the main transitions were explained.

"The Censor" Is Not Watching

After describing the ridiculous and irrational things people do in their dreams, *Life* reports that the dream process is a "low grade mental activity, comparable to that exhibited while awake by the drugged, drunk and delirious. Like them, we in our dreams command poor analytical ability. We are in faulty communication with reality. The coward and the censor in us are looking the other way." Perhaps we have an unconscious truism here—the Censor *is* looking the other way. The Real Man, the superconscious Self, is certainly not involved in the delusions of the lower order of dreams, and during the deep-sleep of the body, according to ancient and modern Theosophy, returns to its own "home," a state of universal knowing and communing. H. P. Blavatsky states:

> The "principles" active during ordinary dreams—which ought to be distinguished from real dreams, and called idle visions—are *Kama,* the seat of the personal Ego and of desire awakened into chaotic activity by the slumbering reminiscences of the lower Manas. . . . That which is entirely *terra incognita f*or Science is the real dreams and experiences of the higher Ego, which are also called dreams, but ought not to be so termed, or else the term for the other sleeping "visions" changed. (*Transactions,* p. 59-60.)

Thus it seems unlikely that will-born dreams from the Higher Ego, dreams of warning or prophecy, or dreams of prior incarnations, will be reflected into the brain of the personality at the instigation of the sleep "vivisecting" physiologist or psychologist, however well-meaning.

"LETTERS" FROM THE UNDERGROUND?

A New York psychologist stated, respecting Dr. Kleitman's discoveries: "To those of us who have been trying to unravel the mysteries of the mind and the brain, this is a historic breakthrough," and some psychiatrists feel a valuable new avenue is open to them in getting at the root of mental illness. Dream researchers "had until now been at the mercy of the hazy, morning-after recall of their subjects. Now they can monitor a man's sleep, arouse him in the middle of a dream and record it while it still retains its original form and emotional impact," before the dreamer's instincts of self-protection have time to distort or suppress. However, thus far the physiological level of approach has hardly been transcended, and *Life* admits that "to date the significance of dreaming still remains a mystery":

> Much as the scientists have learned and hope to learn through future research, they still confront some of the old mysteries. What do dreams mean? Where do they come from? Are they random scraps of memories, by chance recalled and not worth a second thought? Are they tales we tell, to pass the time of sleep? Or are they letters from the underground deep within?

"Until we know," Kleitman says, "the best way to look upon dreaming is as something that is there, like rain or snow—pleasant at times and for certain persons, painful at other times and for other persons."

DUAL ASPECT OF DREAMING

Apparently Dr. Kleitman is specializing in a sort of research about a sort of dream, which tends to obscure other and more significant aspects of "intuitional" breakthrough in the dream state. A quotation from Erich Fromm's *The Forgotten Language* is suggestive:

> Is it surprising that in a state of sleep, when we are alone with ourselves, when we can look into ourselves without being bothered by the noise and nonsense that surround us in the daytime, we are better able to feel and to think our truest and most valuable feelings and thoughts? This, then, is the conclusion at which we arrive: the state of sleep has an ambiguous function. In it the lack of contact with culture makes for the appearance both of our worst *and* our best; therefore, if we dream, we may be less intelligent, less wise, and less decent, but we may also be better and wiser than in our waking life.

For Every Light, a Shadow

Zen Buddhism, reports *Time,* July 21, grows "more chic by the minute." The latest evidence, says *Time,* is the summer issue of the Chicago Review, which contains "nine articles on the subject, a poem, and an excerpt from Zen-loving, 'beat' Novelist Jack Kerouac's forthcoming *The Dharma Bums,*" which begins: "Let there be blowing-out and bliss forevermore." *Time* sketches "beat" Zen:

> Long rooted in Japan, Zen is an ancient Chinese technique of mind-breaking discipline aimed at freeing the will. All things bubble along in one interrelated continuum, says Zen. Why try to "grasp" or "stop" them? The real problem is spontaneity: how to "let go" and "go with" the permanent impermanence. The Zen disciple must destroy his ego-consciousness, until his real self calmly floats on the world's confusion like a pingpong ball skimming down a mountain stream.

"Square" Zen

> For Anglo-Saxons, says Author Alan W. Watts, former Anglican priest and a leading U.S. exponent of Zen, the main obstacle to the achievement of Zen's peace is an inability to purge themselves of the need for self-justification. The urge to prove oneself right "has always jiggled the Chinese sense of the ludicrous." The Chinese rated human-heartedness ahead of righteousness, felt that one could not be right without also being wrong. "At the roots of Chinese life there is a trust in the good-and-evil of one's own nature which is peculiarly foreign to those brought up with the chronic uneasy conscience of the Hebrew-Christian cultures."

Nevertheless, the calm acceptance of one's self, which is the essence of Zen philosophy, is so far removed from the frothy, irresponsible ebullience of "beat Zen," that we are moved to ask, Is *this* Zen?

Natural Resources Tapped

From the New York *Times,* Aug. 3, we learn that "greatly stepped-up research and experimentation is now being carried on in various parts of the world to develop little-utilized sources" of energy to replace the fast-diminishing fossil fuels, such as coal, petroleum, and peat:

> The energy to be tapped is of five types. They are generally referred to as solar, wind, tidal, geothermic (from the earth's interior heat) and sea-thermal (from the different temperatures in the water). Experiments or actual use have demonstrated that all can produce electric and mechanical power. . . . Solar energy, in particular, may well play a part some day in astronautics or space travel. . . .

> The sun is the source of not only all life but all food, fuel, rain and water-power. The energy emanating from its rays within a few minutes is greater than the annual global consumption of all types of energy. Utilization of only a small part of this force could go far to solve possible shortages in the future.

EGOIC STAMINA

The amazing resources of the human spirit are shown in an item sent us. The New York *Herald Tribune* (March 19), tells of a seventeen-year-old girl who, although paralyzed most of her life, has learned to write with the pencil held in her mouth. She explains: "I just like to learn . . . I didn't want to keep dictating the things I wanted to write, so I just took a pencil and started trying. It looked like scribbling at first, but I kept practicing and practicing."

Now, this girl is a high school student making straight "A" grades and planning for college enrollment.

THE SKIN ACTS AS AUDITORY ORGAN

An example of the interchangeability of the senses is demonstrated by an experiment reported in the New York *Times* (April 13):

> Dr. Georg von Bekesy, of the Harvard Psychoacoustic Laboratory, described how he has constructed a sort of "substitute ear" that relayed distinguishable sound waves to the skin . . . The "ears" were constructed by Dr. von Bekesy to operate like the inaccessible cochlea and basilar membrane of the ear, which convey sound impulses to the auditory nerve. . . .
>
> During the experiments, Dr. von Bekesy reported, the apparatus picked up sound waves in the room. Some of these sounds, of certain pitch or frequency, were "heard," or felt by the subjects in the way that they are perceived by the cochlea of the ear.

AN APPEAL FOR ORGANIZATIONAL UNITY

Theosophists: Reunite! (Christopher, 1958, $4.85) by F. Pierce Spinks is an earnest argument for a single Theosophical organization to replace the several groups which now exist. The author grew up in the Point Loma society (now The Theosophical Society, with headquarters at Pasadena, Calif.), but for some years past has been actively campaigning for this form of unification of the Movement. The book is written with obvious good will, and plainly represents Mr. Spinks' honest conviction that the Theosophical Movement can fulfill its great role in the world only through attaining to organizational unity. Fundamentally, the book is an exhortation to Brotherhood on this basis, the

implication being that for those calling themselves "Theosophists" to remain in unrelated organizations constitutes a willful violation of the first object of the original Theosophical Society. Sections of *Theosophists: Reunite!* are taken up with the author's analysis of the differences among the various societies and groups (for the most part, the discussion is limited to the Adyar society, the Pasadena society, and U.L.T.). Mr. Spinks then submits the judgment that these differences are superficial from the Theosophical point of view and ought not to be barriers to organizational unity.

The Ever-present Paradox

On the whole, Mr. Spinks adopts the position of the Adyar Theosophical Society concerning what is to be regarded as Theosophy. There can be no dogma, no canonical list of "acceptable" works, hence all writings claiming to be Theosophical have an equal claim on the attention of the student, who is free to decide for himself what is worthy of study.

The difficulty with this view, which can hardly be examined at length here, is that it presents a political view of what is in essence a philosophical issue. Whether or not certain writings represent a unique contribution to the Theosophical Movement, whether a careful faithfulness to the conceptions of the teacher or teachers is important or not—these are philosophic questions, not political questions. Should these philosophic questions be of the utmost importance to the true progress of Theosophy in the world, then their neglect would constitute unqualified betrayal of the ideals of the Movement. Mr. Spinks' neglect of this question constitutes the major defect of his book.

The "Spirit" of Brotherhood

In contrast to the political view of organizational unity as the prime need of the Movement, is the conception of the Movement as an educational undertaking in which the integrity of philosophic ideas is the crucial element. The safeguarding of the purity of the philosophy, and the spread of that philosophy in the form presented by the original teachers—not simply because they were the original teachers, but because of the quality of the instruction found therein—would seem to be the primary obligation of those who regard Theosophy as a teaching rather than some undefined content of an official organization.

It would be the greatest of folly for students of H.P.B. who conceive the Movement in these terms to submit to the dissipating compulsions of political unity, in the pursuit of the form of brotherhood, when they believe that the *substance* of brotherhood takes no thought of either the existence or nonexistence of organizations. Organizations are one of the many mechanisms which *de facto* brotherhood may employ, depending upon the circumstances and the needs of the time. That the *spirit* of brotherhood may easily cross over the barriers of separate organizations was demonstrated last summer in the several meetings held on August 11 and 12 by West Coast Theosophists, regardless of their affiliation, in commemoration of the birthday of H. P. Blavatsky. It is to the credit of Mr. Spinks, and clear evidence of his brotherly motives, that these meetings took place largely as a result of his inspiration and efforts.

USEFUL REFERENCES

It is not surprising that a work such as Mr. Spinks', so clearly founded on a sincere and constructively intended aim, should reach effectively beyond partisanship in the discussion of the past turns and twists of the Movement since 1875. For this, if not for all of Mr. Spinks' arguments, all Theosophical students will be grateful. Also, Mr. Spinks has provided, in appendices, the full text of the *modus operandi*—whether formally constitutional, or simply declarative—of the three groups most prominently in the public eye during this century.

A comparative reading of constitutions, articles of incorporation, and declaration of intent to follow a specific leader or Head, invites philosophic reflection in many ways. After all, there is certainly much by way of implication in the Theosophical philosophy itself to encourage the practice of essential democratic principles, but, on the other hand, an association of Theosophical students, believing in the value of following essential *teachings* for guidance, resembles an institution of learning more closely than a benevolent or fraternal organization.

One thing is sure—there is no guarantee that *any* method of association will preserve the heart of Theosophy as a dynamic movement of *ideas*. Mr. Spinks, while he may not have focussed his attention upon this essential consideration, has provided a basis for much discussion.

THE UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS

DECLARATION

The policy of this Lodge is independent devotion to the cause of Theosophy, without professing attachment to any Theosophical organization. It is loyal to the great Founders of the Theosophical Movement, but does not concern itself with dissensions or differences of individual opinion.

The work it has on hand and the end it keeps in view are too absorbing and too lofty to leave it the time or inclination to take part in side issues. That work and that end is the dissemination of the Fundamental Principles of the philosophy of Theosophy, and the exemplification in practice of those principles, through a truer realization of the SELF; a profounder conviction of Universal Brotherhood.

It holds that the unassailable basis for union among Theosophists, wherever and however situated, is "similarity of aim, purpose and teaching," and therefore has neither Constitution, By-Laws nor Officers, the sole bond between its Associates being that basis. And it aims to disseminate this idea among Theosophists in the furtherance of Unity.

It regards as Theosophists all who are engaged in the true service of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, condition or organization, and

It welcomes to its association all those who are in accord with its declared purposes and who desire to fit themselves, by study and otherwise, to be the better able to help and teach others.

"The true Theosophist belongs to no cult or sect; yet belongs to each and all."

Being in sympathy with the purposes of this Lodge, as set forth in its "Declaration," I hereby record my desire to be enrolled as an Associate, it being understood that such association calls for no obligation on my part, other than that which I, myself, determine.

The foregoing is the form signed by Associates of the United Lodge of Theosophists. Inquiries are invited from all persons to whom this Movement may appeal. Cards for signatures will be sent upon request, and every possible assistance furnished Associates in their studies and in efforts to form local Lodges. There are no fees of any kind, and no formalities to be complied with. Write to:

GENERAL REGISTRAR, UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS,
Theosophy Hall, 33rd and Grand Ave., Los Angeles 7, Calif.

U. L. T. LODGES

AMSTERDAM, Z. HOLLAND.....123 Stadionweg
ANTWERP, (BERCHEM) BELGIUM.....Transvaal Straat 62
BANGALORE CITY, INDIA.....15 Sir Krishna Rao Rd., Basavangudi
BERKELEY 4, CALIFORNIA.....Masonic Temple Bldg., Bancroft and Shattuck
BOMBAY 1, INDIA.....Theosophy Hall, 40 New Marine Lines
LAGUNA BEACH, CALIFORNIA.....1175 South Coast Boulevard
LEIDEN, HOLLAND.....Roodenburgerstraat 35
LONDON W. 2, ENGLAND.....Robert Crosbie House, 62 Queen's Gardens
LONDON, ONTARIO, CANADA.....524 William Street
LOS ANGELES 7, CALIFORNIA.....245 West 33rd Street
MATUNGA, BOMBAY 19, INDIA.....Anandi Nivas, Bhaudaji Road
NEW YORK 21, NEW YORK.....347 East 72nd Street
PARIS 16, FRANCE.....11 bis rue Keppler
PHILADELPHIA 3, PENNSYLVANIA.....1917 Walnut Street
PHOENIX, ARIZONA.....2419 East McDowell Road
READING, PENNSYLVANIA.....812 North Fifth Street
SACRAMENTO 14, CALIFORNIA.....1237½ H Street
SAN DIEGO 3, CALIFORNIA.....3148 Fifth Avenue
SAN FRANCISCO 14, CALIFORNIA.....166 Sanchez Street
SAN LEANDRO, CALIFORNIA.....579 Foothill Boulevard
SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA.....Federation House, 166 Phillip Street
WASHINGTON 9, D. C. .....1722 Connecticut Ave., N.W.

THEOSOPHICAL PUBLICATIONS

Books by H. P. Blavatsky:

ISIS UNVEILED, a photographic facsimile of the Original Edition, the two volumes bound in one	$ 7.50
THE SECRET DOCTRINE, facsimile edition, two volumes in one	8.50
INDEX TO THE SECRET DOCTRINE, for students	4.00
THE SECRET DOCTRINE *and* INDEX	12.00
THE KEY TO THEOSOPHY, facsimile of Original Edition	3.00
THEOSOPHICAL GLOSSARY, facsimile of Original Edition	5.00
TRANSACTIONS OF THE BLAVATSKY LODGE	2.50
THE VOICE OF THE SILENCE	1.50

Books by William Q. Judge:

THE OCEAN OF THEOSOPHY	2.00
LETTERS THAT HAVE HELPED ME, new and enlarged edition	3.00
THE BHAGAVAD-GITA	1.50
NOTES ON THE BHAGAVAD-GITA	2.50
PATANJALI'S YOGA APHORISMS	2.00
THE HEART DOCTRINE, Miscellaneous collection, paper cover	1.00
VERNAL BLOOMS, selected articles from W.Q.J. (paper cover)	1.00

Other Books:

THE FRIENDLY PHILOSOPHER, Letters and Talks by Robert Crosbie	3.00
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON THE "OCEAN," by Robert Crosbie	2.00
THE ETERNAL VERITIES, for children, new edition	3.50
TEACHER'S MANUAL AND GUIDE TO THE "ETERNAL VERITIES"	2.50
"BECAUSE—" FOR THE CHILDREN WHO ASK WHY	2.00
LIGHT ON THE PATH, Bombay Edition	1.50
THROUGH THE GATES OF GOLD, written down by "M.C."	1.50
OCCULT TALES, by H. P. Blavatsky and Wm. Q. Judge	2.00
FROM THE BOOK OF IMAGES, a volume of Indian tales	1.00
THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, 1875-1950	5.00
SELECTIONS FROM THE UPANISHADS, AND THE TAO TE KING	2.00
THE DHAMMAPADA	2.00

Pamphlets:

THEOSOPHY SIMPLY STATED (10 copies, 50 cents; 50 copies, $2.00)	.10
CONVERSATIONS ON THEOSOPHY, including the "Three Fundamentals"	.10
REINCARNATION AND KARMA, the "Aphorisms," by Wm. Q. Judge	.10
THOUGHTS FOR THINKERS, a helpful essay	.10
WHAT IS DEATH?	.10
THE VOCATION OF LIFE	.10
THE UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS, its history, purpose, and methods	.25
FIVE MESSAGES TO AMERICAN THEOSOPHISTS, by H. P. Blavatsky	.25
EPITOME OF THEOSOPHY, by William Q. Judge	.25
ECHOES FROM THE ORIENT, by William Q. Judge	.50
MORAL EDUCATION, new and enlarged edition	.50
A CHRISTIAN AND A THEOSOPHIST	.25
THE LAWS OF HEALING, Physical and Metaphysical	.50
STATES AFTER DEATH, and Spiritualistic "Communications" Explained	.35
CYCLES OF PSYCHISM, The Import of Psychic Evolution	.50
HYPNOTISM—A PSYCHIC MALPRACTICE	.25
WHAT IS THEOSOPHY? A collation from H. P. Blavatsky	.25

Prices subject to change without notice. Order from

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY

245 West 33rd Street, Los Angeles 7, California
347 East 72nd Street, New York 21, New York